REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-10, 12-29, and 31-38 will remain pending in this application. Claims 11 and 30 were previously cancelled. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the present amendment. For example, the matter added to claims 1, 9, 20, and 28 is supported in the Specification at least at paragraphs [0012], [0053]-[0054], and [0060]. Further, the matter added to claims 3, 9, 22, and 28 is supported in the Specification at paragraph [0006] ("A trigger is a unique type of stored procedure that runs when data in a specified table is modified using one or more data modification operations.").

Claims 1-10, 12-29, and 31-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,358,552 ("Snyder") in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 6,732,089 ("Sinn").

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-10, 12-29, and 31-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Snyder in view of Sinn. As per claim 1, Applicant understands the rejection to be based on the premise that Snyder discloses the method as claimed, except for the step of automatically registering each stored procedure with the device database. Sinn is understood to be cited as supplying this missing teaching.

Applicant traverses the rejection. Claim 1 is directed to a method for deploying at least one stored procedure to a device. A data project and a device database associated with an installation property are generated within a solution. The data project is associated with the device database. The at least one stored procedure is added to the data project. The at least one stored procedure comprises a precompiled set of one or more statements for accessing data in a database. A request to build the solution is received. Responsive to the request, each stored procedure in the data project is automatically embedded into and registered with the device database. The device database is deployed with the at least one embedded stored procedure as a single unit to the device. The device database is installed with the at least one embedded stored procedure on the device according to the installation property.

By contrast, Applicant respectfully submits that Snyder and Sinn fail to disclose at least the limitations of ". . . a device database associated with an installation property . . ." and "installing the device database with the at least one embedded stored procedure on the device according to the installation property." While the cited passages at column 30 of Snyder briefly mention installation of the test executive, there is no disclosure relating to an installation property, and no disclosure relating to installing a device database according to such an installation property.

Accordingly, Snyder and Sinn fail to disclose, whether considered individually or in combination, all of the elements of claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are also patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn at least by reason of this dependency. Further, claim 3 recites that a trigger is executed in response to a data modification operation. This definition of a trigger is supported in the instant Specification at least at paragraph [0006]. While column 4, lines 50-52, and Figure 2 of Snyder are cited as teaching a "trigger," it does not appear that Snyder teaches a "trigger" as defined in claim 3 as being executed in response to a data modification operation. Rather, Snyder merely teaches storing a result indicating whether a measured value falls outside of normal bounds.

Claim 20 contains similar limitations to those found in claim 1 and is also patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn. Claims 21-27 depend from claim 20 and are patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn at least by reason of this dependency. Further, claim 22, like claim 3, recites that a trigger is executed in response to a data modification operation.

As per claim 9, the rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Snyder discloses the method as claimed, except for the step of automatically registering each stored procedure with the device database. Sinn is understood to be cited as supplying this missing teaching.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 9 is directed to a method for deploying at least one stored procedure comprising a precompiled set of one or more statements for accessing data in a database to a device. A first interface is provided that enables a data project containing the at least one stored procedure and a trigger that is executed in response to a data modification operation and a device project containing a device database to be generated within a solution. The first interface further enables the

stored procedure and the trigger to be associated with the device database. The device database is associated with an installation property comprising one of an always overwrite setting, an overwrite if different setting, and a never overwrite setting. A second interface is provided that enables the at least one stored procedure and the trigger to be added to an assembly within the data project. A request is received to build the solution. Responsive to the request, the assembly is automatically embedded within and registered with the device database. The device database is deployed with the embedded assembly as a single unit to the device. The deployed device database is then installed on the device according to the installation property. In particular, if the installation property comprises the always overwrite setting, then any existing device database that was previously installed on the device is overwritten. If the installation property comprises the overwrite if different setting, then the existing device database is overwritten only if the deployed device database is different from the existing device database. If the installation property comprises the never overwrite setting, then the deployed device database is only installed if no existing device database was previously installed on the device.

Thus, claim 9 recites the limitations of claims 1 and 3, and in addition further defines the installation property as comprising one of an always overwrite setting, an overwrite if different setting, and a never overwrite setting, and specifies how the deployed device database is installed to the device in each of these scenarios. Accordingly, claim is patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn at least for these reasons and for the reasons discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 3.

Claim 28 contains similar limitations as those found in claim 9 and is also patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn. Claims 10 and 12-19 depend from claim 9, and claims 29 and 31-38 depend from claim 28. These claims are also patentable over Snyder in view of Sinn at least by reason of these dependencies.

Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejection of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and removed.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: November 3, 2008   /Kenneth R. Eiferman/
                                                    Kenneth R. Eiferman
                                                    Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439